

Art Unit: 1753

The examiner has addressed everything in this printer's rush previously. The examiner addressed the issue of items 2 and 3 in the XRUSH of 10/15/2004 and addressed item 1 in the XRUSH of 8/03/2005. In short, item 1 resulted from the printer not realizing that the drawings in the file are from a FWC and there should be no problem with the different application number on the drawings. Even if that were not satisfactory to the printer, the examiner had the drawings rescanned without the application number thereby removing that barrier to their use. See XRUSH 8/03/2005. Items 2 and 3 were a result of the scanner not scanning a number of documents and those issues have long since been resolved. The printer should not need a new FWCLM for 6-15-2004 because of the rescanned IIFW showing the status of the claims on allowance. Moreover, the FWCLM of 6-15-2004 is just a duplicate of the FWCLM of 4-11-1997, which is readable. The issue of claim 33 is moot now that the rescanned IIFW is in the file and shows that claim 33 is indeed cancelled. See XRUSH and IIFW of 10/15/2004. Why have you given us this identical rush again? If our previous~~ly~~ responses did not resolve the printer's concerns, then PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY. Please do not keep giving us this same rush without explanation when we believe we have fully respond to all the inquiries. Thank you.

Kaj Olsen

AU 1753.